

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

**Status of the Claims**

Before this Response, claims 1-14 and 20-26 were present for examination. No claims are amended, canceled, or added. Therefore, claims 1-14 and 20-26 are present for examination, and claims 1, 10, and 24 are the independent claims.

The Office Action dated January 6, 2009 ("Office Action") rejected claims 1-14, 20, 21, and 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the cited portions of Masukura et al, U.S. Publication No. 2004/0148640 ("Masukura"), and further in view of the cited portions of Yamauchi et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,907,659 ("Yamauchi"), and Official Notice. The Office Action rejected claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Masukura and Yamauchi, and further in view of the cited portions of Duffield et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,461,427 ("Duffield"). The Office Action also objected to the Drawings. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration for the reasons that follow.

**35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections, Masukura et al.**

The Office Action rejected independent claims 1, 10, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Masukura in view of Yamauchi and Official Notice. However, neither Yamauchi or Masukura can be relied upon to teach or suggest "transmitting the video program having the first aspect ratio and the [dynamically changing] video conversion information to a second location geographically away from the first location," as recited in claim 1. Claims 10 and 24 contain related limitations.

The Office specifically concedes that Masakura does not teach transmission of video conversion information that converts video program having a first aspect ratio to a second aspect ratio. Therefore, there can clearly be no teaching in Masakura regarding the transmission of dynamically changing video conversion information.

The claims generally recite transmitting, with a streaming video program, video conversion information which changes across stream of images. The Office relies on Yamauchi to teach this dynamically changing video conversion information. But Yamauchi falls short.

First, the Office asserts that Yamauchi teaches "steps for converting a display from a first aspect ratio to a second aspect ratio." But this is merely a discussion in the Yamauchi Background section where it is suggested that programs with a 4:3 aspect ratio may be converted to 16:9, and vice versa. A general background discussion on the local conversion in Yamauchi from a first to a second aspect ratio falls far short of suggesting the transmission of dynamically changing "video conversion information to a second location geographically away from the first location," set forth in claim 1.

Next, the Office asserts that "Fig. 13A-C and 27A-D teach that the conversion information can change from frame-to-frame," but Applicants can find no such teaching in the cited reference (Final Office Action, p. 5, ll. 18-19). The independent claims in the present application specify that dynamically changing aspect ratio conversion information is transmitted with a streaming video program. The cited Figures merely show screen shots with different aspect ratios. Applicants can find no cite in the Office Action to the Specification of Yamauchi where aspect ratio conversion information changes across a stream of images. It is respectfully requested that the Office point out where, in the discussion related to FIGS. 13A-C and 27A-D in Yamauchi, that dynamically changing aspect ratio conversion information is transmitted with a streaming video program.

In sum, claim 1 generally calls for the transmission, to a geographically away location, of *aspect ratio conversion information* that *dynamically changes* across a stream of images; and Yamauchi fails to teach this limitation.

Moreover, it is worth noting that Yamauchi is directed at a "multimedia optical disc and disc reproduction apparatus which can superimpose subtitles onto a main video image." This localized multimedia video apparatus has at most a tenuous relation to the video distribution systems and methods of the claims. The claims at issue generally set forth a video distribution

system where video programs are distributed to locations “geographically away” from the originating location, clearly different than the disc apparatus of Yamauchi.

Applicants respectfully submit that the specified limitations in independent claims 1, 10, and 24 are allowable for at least the foregoing reasons. Claims 2-9, 11-14, 20-23, and 25-26 each depend from these independent claims, and are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as given above. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the §103(a) rejections to these claims be withdrawn.

**Objections to Drawings**


The Office Action objected to the Drawings, contending that “the first and second subset of the stream of images recited in claims 24-26 must be shown.” As set forth in the Amendment dated May 29, 2008 at page 8, this is shown in the original Specification and Drawings (Original Application, p. 7, ll. 9-11; p. 9, ll. 25-34; p. 14, ll. 9, 24-25; ref. num. 1932, Fig. 19A). Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Michael L. Drapkin  
Reg. No. 55,127

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 303-571-4000  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
MLD:sk  
61770978 v1